

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 592

CG 006 838

AUTHOR Dragan, J. W.
TITLE Counsellor Certification - Panacea or Placebo?
INSTITUTION Manitoba Dept. of Youth and Education, Winnipeg.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at Canadian Guidance and Counseling Association convention, Toronto, May 30 - June 2, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Counseling Instructional Programs; *Counseling Programs; *Counselor Certification; *Counselor Evaluation; *Counselor Performance; Counselor Training; Standards

ABSTRACT

An 8 month study of the certification practices and procedures for school counsellors throughout Canada and the U. S. has led this investigator to the conclusion that present certification procedures are largely limiting, unimaginative, academically-oriented, bound by fixed course hours--and are set too low. Methods for certification vary from what might be referred to as: (1) the minimum standards route; (2) the skill areas approach; (3) the approved program method; and (4) a performance-based demonstration of competence. Regardless of the method used, problems abound, e.g., most certification requirements guarantee exposure to courses--not competence. Additional problems are noted in the areas of grandfather clauses, the teaching requirement, reciprocity between states, enforcement policies, non-differentiated certificates, accountability of training institutions, provisional certificates, norm writing, and many more. The question of "Who should administer a certification system?" is also examined, as are likely trends in the certification of counsellors. (Author)

Paper Presented to the 1971, C. G. C. A. Convention, Toronto

J. W. Dragan, Consultant
Student Personnel Services
Department of Youth and Education
Province of Manitoba

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

"COUNSELLOR CERTIFICATION - PANACEA OR PLACEBO?"

My topic, 'Counsellor Certification - Panacea or Placebo?' poses a question. For those of you who are anxious to get to lunch, or who would like some additional time to see Toronto, I will answer it right now and let you do your thing. Here goes. In their search for a panacea for the problem of the unqualified and at times harmful counsellor, many states, and perhaps even provinces, have instituted a system of prevention, called certification, which has the same effect as a placebo. But these people feel that they have done something about the problem, and that makes them feel good. And feeling good is a good way to feel.

Up to this point, I've said all that I really know for sure. From here on in, it's pure speculation.

About a year ago, when I became deeply involved in the problem of certification of counsellors, I found out a lot of interesting things about that word "certification". Like it had the power to attract or repel people depending on whether you said you were in favour or against it. That it could really frighten people, people who had been in the field longer than they would care to remember. Or that it was sought as a legitimate way to have a good old fashioned witch hunt. Although I haven't tried it yet, I'm convinced that the way to liven up a sagging party is to quietly whisper the word "certification".

I guess I'm trying to say that the term is such an emotionally loaded one that it makes an objective examination of the problem almost impossible. It's at times like this that I very much envy the way little children can be honest with themselves - or the way that they tell all they know and then stop.

For example, take the case of some grade 4 kids who studied about petroleum and then wrote a test on it. How is this one for honesty. One kid wrote "Oil is sometimesedly trapped close to a salt dome. Maybe it is trapped over the salt dome, maybe it is trapped under. I do not know. It takes all my knowing to know it is trapped close to the salt dome". They may be honest, but like us, they are often confused, as the little fellow who wrote "In order to understand about petro-chemistry, I need only to look at upholstery, sink tops, and other things. Somehow this explains it to me conclusively". And being like us, sometimes their

logic leaves something to be desired, as the child who said "Someone in here said toys can be made from petroleum. Is this so? I believe it is because I think I was the one that said it".

But I started out to tell you about my work in the area of certification. I had wanted to learn a great deal about the certification of counsellors, about its procedures and problems, its advantages and drawbacks, its challenges and failings, in the hope that it would stimulate some serious discussion which might even eventually result in a formal system for the certification of school counsellors in the province of Manitoba. So I began to talk to people about it, read what others said on it, and wrote to still others for their assistance. Before I knew it, I found myself engulfed in a mass of data - and hooked on working it through.

TABLES RE CONTACT SUMMARY (Tables # Ia and Ib)

In my contacts, I found that whether states or provinces were just starting to investigate certification, or were re-vamping their current procedures, or because it had been in effect for so long, simply taking it for granted, there was a tremendous interest in knowing what was happening elsewhere. For this reason, I would very much like to share with you some of the things that I learned. Some of these are simple observations, others are clouded by my own biases, and some perhaps are a little wishful thinking - but it's the way it has meaning for me.

Let's do a quick review. In the U. S., every state has certification for school counsellors. Maryland was the first in the 1930's -- and Michigan was the last in 1970. Although procedures and requirements vary, a "typical" state certificate might involve the following:

- 1.) It would be issued by the state Department of Education which is normally the final authority on certification.
- 2.) The certificate issued would be a separate one -- not an endorsement on the teaching certificate.
- 3.) It would normally constitute at least two levels. The first would be provisional or temporary and the second would be professional or permanent.
- 4.) The certificate would be nondifferentiated. That is, one certificate would be good for all grade levels.
- 5.) The certificate would be issued for a certain period of time, but would be renewable to life based on added course work and satisfactory performance.

- 6.) The certificate would not likely be recognized in any other state.
- 7.) Typical requirements would include:
 - a.) Two years teaching experience.
 - b.) One year nonteaching work experience.
 - c.) Master's in guidance and counselling from an accredited university (with specified areas of preparation).
 - d.) A recommendation of the training institution.

In Canada, four provinces have certification of counsellors (Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and P. E. I.). A fifth, New Brunswick, recently had legislation before their House to follow suit. A sixth, Saskatchewan, has an endorsement on the teaching certificate. The seventh, eighth, and ninth, Alberta, Manitoba, and Newfoundland, are currently examining the whole question. The tenth, B. C., at least from the viewpoint of their provincial Guidance Branch, does not appear to favour certification. Perhaps we might take a look at what's involved in certification in those provinces that have instituted it.

TABLES RE CANADIAN CERTIFICATION (Tables # 2a to 2b)

I suppose one of my first real learnings, and disappointments, was to become aware of the various motivations for implementing certification in the first place. You see, I had asked that very question, "Why was certification implemented?" - and I must admit that I expected every response to be centred around the child in some way - like "We did it in order to give the students ready access to a highly skilled individual who could provide meaningful assistance", or some such thing as that. Some states or provinces said just that. Others said something quite different - like "to safeguard the professional interests of its members." Others said it was done to stop a practice, i.e., "to prevent school administrators from assigning guidance responsibilities to classroom teachers". Still others said it has something to do with content of university courses - and it came out this way - "to ensure that counsellors had taken specific subject matter". Some laid it right on the line when they said it was "to protect the child from incompetent, unprofessional counsellors". Still others said they only had a vague idea why it was started. It happened long before they assumed office they said, and the records are rather fuzzy.

A second important learning was that of discovering the different ways used to certify counsellors. Surprisingly enough, there really are only four distinct ways that this is being done. The first method, what I would call the "Minimum Standards Route" - would apply for example to P. E. I. That is, certification is

based on the completion of a number of specific courses, which are normally defined, on the accumulation of x number of hours of course credit.

Ontario, Nova Scotia, and Quebec, however use what is called a "Skill Areas" approach. This involves outlining specific skill areas, such as counselling, organization of guidance services, the information services, and requiring a candidate to have studied in each of the areas. Here, studying the area assumes that the person will have competence in that area. The areas of study usually culminate in a degree like the Master's, and the candidate must normally be recommended by the training institution for certification. Moreover, the candidate is required to first have a teaching certificate plus some teaching experience. (but not in Quebec)

These two procedures, the Minimum Standards Route, and the Skill Areas approach, constitute the most frequently used methods for certifying counsellors across the country. Unfortunately, they are also the most restrictive, limiting, and unimaginative approaches to the problem. They often do not guarantee proficiency or competence, but merely exposure to graduate courses.

But there are other, more exciting ways of dealing with the problem. One such vehicle gaining a great deal of popularity is called the "Approved Program Method" or "Entitlement". The essence of this is that the counsellor education faculty of the university or college, not the Department of Education, is charged with assessing the competencies of candidates and determining whether they are qualified for certification. They would do this according to the following. The competencies required by school counsellors at various levels would be defined. Then specific course work and other experiences would be designed to build the particular skills. Persons would be certified when their counsellor educators feel they do in fact have the specific competencies. This means that the time period necessary to complete the "requirements", and the amount and nature of course work required, would vary from person to person -- depending on his rate of growth and ability.

With this method, a significant shift has occurred. By placing the emphasis on individual competence, program approval has served to eliminate the counting of courses or credits, with the result that programs may vary considerably from one institution to another depending upon the means used to develop competencies. Under this system, a person considering graduate study in the area of counsellor education would be ill advised to ask the question, "How many credits do I need to be certified as a school counsellor?" Rather, he should ask, "What are the

competencies expected of an elementary or secondary school counsellor, and what experiences will be provided to enable me to develop and demonstrate such competencies?"

Just to show you how resourceful people can be, the State of Washington has developed a fourth way of certifying counsellors. Theirs is a performance - based, behavioral objective system of certification which hinges on the candidate's ability to demonstrate his competencies. But his skills are not judged by counsellor educators. Instead, with this plan, competence must be demonstrated on the job to the satisfaction of colleagues and clients. This unique plan, which is now in its second year, requires all counsellors to develop a plan through their school division to assess themselves and meet the performance standards of their plan. Since everyone must participate, there is no need for grandfather clauses.

The key to the program is what is referred to as the partnership principle where four distinct groups -- the School Divisions, the counsellor education faculty, the counsellors' professional association, and the Department of Education, work together. Their job is to formulate standards and a counsellor role, show counsellors how to assess themselves, develop training units, and finally to decide who meets the criteria. Each of the possible plans from which a counsellor may choose -- and each plan will vary according to his goals -- includes a counsellor role and function statement, a list of the competencies required by the school division, a self-assessment and training plan, and a list of the options that he can take to become certified.

To be able to implement the plan, the University of Washington has been training a group of what are called "staff development consultants" -- whose primary function is training. These consultants are competent, practicing school counsellors who are interested in part-time training with their colleagues who are working on self-renewal plans in order to meet their performance standards. These staff development consultants work with both established counsellors who want help in self-assessment and development, as well as with newly employed counsellors. The training for these staff development consultants consists of writing performance objectives, helping counsellors assess their knowledge and competence, designing training experiences, conducting process groups, sampling counsellor performance through AV media, and evaluating outcomes.

As you can imagine, such a radical departure from tradition met with some expected resistance. The staff people in Washington report that the idea of demonstrating competence again for some counsellors who had the conventional practicum training was annoying, and for those counsellors without such formal counsellor training, it was frightening. And, it is still too early to determine whether or not the approach is effective (it's set to be evaluated at the end of the third year) -- but the 1300 counsellors in Washington, and many in other bordering states, are talking enthusiastically about the project. As you may have recognized, what they are up to is a good deal more than just developing certification for counsellors. While some of the training occurs in the universities, much of it will occur "in the field". And the emphasis is on life-long career development. As such, certification becomes less an end, and more a beginning.

A third important learning was another disappointment - that throughout Canada and the U. S., there was little faith placed in the counsellor improving himself without some externally applied motivation and control. Oh yes, I had pointed to the numbers of counsellors who were going back for training on their own. And I even questioned the need for any external motivational device. For example, I put the question to these resource persons this way - "If a state or province has a counsellor education program at their university, and if the provincial government offers financial assistance to those counsellors who wish to return for more training, and if the professional association of school counsellors takes a stand for the need for improved qualifications, and if the school boards that hire counsellors stress that they are looking for the well-qualified, then would we really need formal certification of our counsellors?" To make a long story short, I got replies from Presidents of school counsellor associations which hinted that I might be out of touch with reality, from State Directors of Guidance that suggested I was, and from heads of counsellor education programs who were convinced of it.

So we undertook a full study of the qualifications of our current guidance personnel in the province.

TABLES RE TRAINING (Tables # 3a to 3e)

You know, the thing that worries me most is that while we in Manitoba are making definite motions toward a certification process for our counsellors, nowhere in my communications with the dozens of states and provinces, nowhere in my perusal of the major journals for the last 10 years, nowhere in the research

reported by Litwack, Getson, Saltzman and company did I find any documented evidence to show that certification of school counsellors was in fact an effective procedure. Granted, there is a lot of evidence to show that counsellors trained in a certain manner, à la Carkhuff, Berenson and Truax, could consistently rate higher on the core conditions of counselling. - But there is much evidence to show that a characteristic called cognitive flexibility - or the ability to think on one's feet, to understate it - a quality of good teachers - is as important to counselling "success" as is empathy. And this is a quality which has not been taught in any counsellor education faculty. This lack of substantive research was yet another disturbing, but important learning.

I had hoped, I must confess, that I would find that the practitioners themselves, the school counsellors, would have a significant voice in the setting of standards and policies by which they would be governed. But I did not find this to be generally true - and that is a nation-wide admission. Moreover, not only have most counsellor associations not engaged in any survey-type research of counsellors' attitudes toward certification, but most associations have been content to function as a voice which represents its members - rather than one which represents the profession itself. As a result, it was not then surprising to learn that counsellor educators appear to be the strongest force for the updating and improvement of certification procedures.

And, I learned that, although it isn't admitted out loud, the majority of states and provinces appear to be plagued with problems in the administration of their certification systems. For example, let me illustrate the more common difficulties:

- 1.) The most frequently used certification methods, which are in fact academically oriented, are conceded to guarantee exposure to courses, not professional competence.
- 2.) The idea of including a grandfather clause contravenes the whole principle of certification.
- 3.) One of the most frequent prerequisites for certification -- the teaching requirement - cannot be justified according to the research findings.
- 4.) In many states and provinces, there are no regulations to prevent the hiring of unqualified persons - in spite of certification requirements.

- 5.) Counsellors may begin to practice when the requirements have only been partially met. Their training may be piecemeal and spread over several years. Many never "put it all together".
- 6.) Certification requirements are not updated as frequently as they should be - with the interval between revisions being as long as ten years.
- 7.) There are few reciprocity agreements between the various states and provinces - which means that a counsellor who meets the certification requirements for one state will not likely meet those of another. And it is difficult to evaluate the counsellor education programs across the country. This becomes a real problem when you consider for example, that one-half of Minnesota's practicing counsellors received their training out of the state.
- 8.) Most states have nondifferentiated certificates - with one certificate covering both elementary and secondary schools - in spite of the fact that we know that the competencies and preparation of the counsellor will be different in each case.
- 9.) Giving the counsellor x number of courses and experiences suggests that you can take anyone and make him a counsellor - whereas the research does not support this either. At the same time, our screening devices, or counsellor selection procedures at the university level, are incredibly varied and confused - and still largely dependent upon previous grades or college board scores.
- 10.) Accountability for the training institution still remains with the state or provincial Department of Education - even though the job of drafting the specific program is the responsibility of the university. Each addition or departure of a key counsellor educator results in tremendous duplication of effort and evaluation by the State Department.
- 11.) Standards for the approval of training programs are the responsibility of regional accrediting bodies, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). However, the requirements for NCATE approval differ from university to university, even within the same state. e.g. Arizona.

University of Arizona - 30 graduate semester hours above the A. B.

Northern Arizona U. - 45 graduate semester hours above the A. B.

Arizona State - 48 graduate semester hours above the A. B.

and now recommends that it be 60 hours.

Think of the problem that Texas has, with 27 different universities offering training in Guidance.

- 12.) Those states which have shifted to performance-based certification are experiencing considerable difficulty in devising means by which the required skills and competencies (often called norms) can be satisfactorily evaluated.
- 13.) Administrative details, like portability of pensions for those transferring from a related discipline to school counselling, have not been resolved in most areas.
- 14.) And generally, although there is a great deal of agreement that provisional or interim certificates should be eliminated, they still prevail.

What then, is our course for Manitoba? The only thing that is clear is that continued avoidance of the problem is sheer folly.

To go the Minimum Standards Route would not meet our needs. To try the Skill Areas approach would be just too convenient -- and would be likened to building the certification standards around the present counsellor education program - rather than the needs of the public school system. To try the Approved Program method would be premature in terms of where our counsellor education faculty finds itself at the moment. Is a performance-based certification system the answer for Manitoba? It too might be premature - but we are definitely taking a long look at it. Let me show you our procedural plan.

TABLE RE PROCEDURAL STAGES (Table # 4)

TABLES RE SCAM STUDY (Tables # 5a to 5e)

One question remains. Who should administer the certification system?

Should the School Counsellors' Association certify counsellors? I don't think so. Granted, there is real merit in giving the job of identifying those individuals who are competent to the group of people who are, in fact, working in the field. If a provincial organization of competent counsellors could be set up for example - admitting to membership only those who in the opinion of the members are competent, then employers could use such membership as evidence of proven ability. But since, in Manitoba, SCAM is a part of MTS - all MTS members who are interested can legally join the Association - regardless of their qualifications - and moreover, have an equal vote in the policies of that Association. On the other hand, if the Counsellors' Association becomes separate from the Teachers' Society - as several U. S. Personnel and Guidance Associations have done - then they can be legitimately accused of having their primary interest vested elsewhere than in the public schools.

Should the MTS certify counsellors? Definitely not - for reasons political, philosophical, jurisdictional, and ethical.

Should the counsellor education faculty certify counsellors? Let's say that they could have a greater voice in what happens if their Department could be accredited - and their program approved - with all that both of these entail. When their program can meet recognized guidelines - and is performance and competency based as opposed to academic and verbal - then their recommendation can be the most important factor - and the role of the provincial Department of Education need only be a perfunctory one.

Should the Department of Youth and Education certify counsellors? Because the Department, and specifically the Minister of Education, has been granted by law under the Education Department Act, the authority for the supervision, control, and direction of all public and secondary schools in the province, I would have to say "yes". Although the Minister may, in his wisdom, make regulations regarding the qualifications of all school personnel, and grant certificates accordingly, there are other, more important reasons. I believe that it is mandatory for the provincial educational agency to take an active leadership role in the promotion of educational change. Were the Department to certify counsellors, it would speak for a firm commitment by all concerned that certified counsellors should and will be employed in the public schools. From another angle, experience in the U. S. has shown that without certification procedures enforced by the State Department, many counsellors, school superintendents, and counsellor education programs will short cut the intent, employment qualifications, quality of training, and the number of counsellors necessary to develop and maintain a minimum quality school guidance program.

Except for the first minute and a half, I have been working my way out on a limb. At this stage, I'm prepared to go all the way and make some predictions about future trends in counsellor certification:

- 1.) The whole concept of certification will come under review - and be attacked on one hand for being rigid and rather unenforceable - and on the other, for being an official instrument for the blessing of the wrong things.
- 2.) There will be a continuous and decided shift from an academic to a performance-based system of certifying counsellors.

- 3.) With this change, the onus of responsibility for determining the philosophy, policies, qualifications, and competencies for certification will slowly shift from state and provincial Departments of Education to the practitioners via their professional associations and to the counsellor education faculties.
- 4.) Although reason and research will call for the elimination of the teaching requirement for certification, tradition and vested interests will see to it that both are retained for some time to come.
- 5.) Certification procedures will be based on a legal foundation, that is, an Act of Legislature, as opposed to a directive from a State or Provincial Department of Education.
- 6.) Reciprocal agreements between states and provinces - with each honouring the certification of the other - will prove to be impossible. And the problem will be avoided by the introduction of probationary periods - in which a certified counsellor in one state will be granted a trial period in another.
- 7.) Certificates issued will indicate specialization - at least whether they are applicable to elementary or secondary levels - and will require about 2 full years of foundations training in a recognized graduate school.
- 8.) You will be happy to know that grandfather clauses will become an anachronism - and that interim and provisional certificates will likely be based on a period of supervised internship or apprenticeship.
- 9.) Certification procedures will involve continuous re-evaluation during the professional life of the counsellor - with refresher courses and field training mandatory at various times for each counsellor.

When I think back on all that I have said here today, I can only conclude one thing: I have told you much more than I know. Thank you very much.

Table # 1a

CERTIFICATION CONTACT SUMMARY (USA)

State	State Director of Guid.	Pres. Couns. Ass'n.	Head Couns. Educ.	State	State Director of Guid.	Pres. Couns. Ass'n.	Head Couns. Educ.
Alabama	X	.		Montana	X		
Alaska	X	.		Nebraska	X		X
Arizona	X			Nevada	X		X
Arkansas	X	X	X	New Jersey	X		
California	X			New Mexico	X		
Colorado	X	X	X	New York	X	X	
Delaware	X		X	North Carolina		X	
Georgia	X		X	North Dakota	X		
Hawaii	X			Ohio	X		X
Idaho	X		X	Oklahoma	X		
Illinois	X			Oregon	X		X
Indiana	X			Pennsylvania	X	X	
Iowa	X			South Dakota	X		X
Kansas	X		X	Texas	X	X	
Kentucky	X	X		Utah	X	X	
Louisiana	X	X	X	Virginia		X	
Maine	X			Washington	X	X	
Maryland	X	X		West Virginia	X		X
Michigan		X		Wisconsin	X	X	X
Minnesota	X	X	XX	Wyoming	X		X
Mississippi	X						
Missouri	X		X				

Table # 1b

CERTIFICATION CONTACT SUMMARY (CANADA)

Province	Provincial Supervisors of Guidance	President Couns. Ass'n.	Head Couns. Educ.	Divisional Supervisors of Guidance
British Columbia	X	X	X	Winnipeg
Alberta	X		X	St. James
Saskatchewan	X	X	X	St. Boniface
Ontario	X	X	X	Duck Mountain
Quebec		X	X	Swan Valley
New Brunswick	X	X		Norwood
Nova Scotia	X		X	Seine River
Prince Edward Island	X	X		Mystery Lake
Newfoundland	X	X		

Table # 2a

ONTARIO

- 1) Formal certification administered by the Registrar of the Department of Education, on recommendation of the Assistant Superintendent (Curriculum Section).

- 2) Certificate issued:

Specialist Certificate In Guidance

- 3) Qualifications for certification:

Two routes (as at 1970) - changed in 1971

Route I: Department of Education Guidance Course

- teaching certificate
- 1 year teaching experience + 180 scheduled hours in Guidance duties
- 4 parts (summers) of Department's Guidance Program

Route II: University Courses in Guidance

- a Master's Degree in Guidance
- a permanent teaching certificate (Ontario)
- one year teaching experience, including guidance duties, in an Ontario school.

NON-CERTIFIED "COUNSELLORS" CANNOT BE HIRED BY THE SCHOOLS.

Table # 2b

QUEBEC

1) Formal certification administered by the Corporation of Guidance Counsellors of Quebec.

2) Certificate issued - A permanent one, similar to that of an MD - or registered psychologist, with a registration number, and renewed annually upon payment of a fee.

*1 credit = 15 hours (lectures)
= 30 hours (lab + practice)*

3) Qualifications for certification:

- Theory and practice in 4 blocks as follows:

I PSYCHOLOGY

Theory 30 credits of 15 hours each, ie, 450 hours
Practice 5 credits of 30 hours each, ie, 150 hours
35 credits 600 hours

*dynamics
learning process
social psych
psycho-pathology
theories of testing
Int + lab in testing*

II GUIDANCE

15 credits of 15 hours each, ie, 225 hours
15 credits of 30 hours each, ie, 450 hours
30 credits 675 hours

*methods
principles
counselling
ethics*

III SOCIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

15 credits of 15 hours each, ie, 225 hours
5 credits of 30 hours each, ie, 150 hours
20 credits 375 hours

*course lab
superv. practicum*

IV RESEARCH

10 credits of 15 hours each, ie, 150 hours
5 credits of 45 hours each, ie, 225 hours
15 credits 375 hours

*career system
socio-econ aspect of careers
Total services*

*Work in an info library
Visits to colleges
forums*

*statistics
research methodology*

Totals 100 credits - - - - - 2025 hours

thesis

NON-CERTIFIED "COUNSELLORS" CANNOT BE HIRED BY THE SCHOOLS.

Table # 2c

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

- 1) Formal Certification administered by the Department of Education.
- 2) Certificate issued:
Certificate Special Guidance
- 3) Qualifications for certification:
 - teacher training
 - 5 courses in Guidance
 - or
 - MA (Psychology) with 1 year practical experience

NON-CERTIFIED "COUNSELLORS" CAN BE HIRED BY THE SCHOOLS.

Table # 2d

NOVA SCOTIA

- 1) Formal certification administered by the Registrar, Department of Education, on recommendation of Assistant Director, Youth & Education (Pupil Personnel).
- 2) Certificates Issued:
 - a) Guidance Specialist Certificate (Permanent)
 - b) Guidance Specialist Certificate (Interim)
 - c) Emergency Guidance Permit
- 3) Qualifications for certification:
 - a) Guidance Specialist Certificate (Permanent)
 - teacher's general certificate
 - either: N.S. Summer Block Program in Guidance
Master's - Specialization in Guidance
(areas of preparation listed)
30 semester hours of graduate study in Guidance
 - half-time experience in guidance for at least 3 years
 - b) Guidance Specialist Certificate (Interim)
 - either: N.S. Summer Block Program in Guidance
Master's - specialization in Guidance
(areas of preparation listed)
30 semester hours of graduate study in Guidance
 - half-time experience in guidance for at least 3 years
 - c) Emergency Guidance Permit
 - teacher's general certificate
 - either: 2 sessions of N.S. Summer Block Program in Guidance
15 semester hours graduate study in Guidance
 - half-time experience in guidance for at least 3 years

NON-CERTIFIED "COUNSELLORS" CAN BE HIRED BY THE SCHOOLS

TABLE # 3a

STATUS (FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME) OF COUNSELLORS - ACCORDING
TO LOCATION AND SEX - REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

Location	Full-Time Counsellors			Part-Time Counsellors		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Metro (198)	47 (52%)	43 (48%)	90 (67%)	59 (55%)	49 (45%)	108 (24%)
Rural (383)	36 (82%)	8 (18%)	44 (33%)	207 (61%)	132 (39%)	339 (76%)
Totals (581)	83 (62%)	51 (38%)	134	266 (59%)	181 (41%)	447

TABLE # 3b

TRAINING OF PART-TIME COUNSELLORS - ACCORDING TO LOCATION AND SEX -
REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

A. PART-TIME MALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (59)	12 (20%)	27 (46%)	14 (24%)	6 (10%)
Rural (207)	114 (55%)	80 (38%)	11 (5%)	2 (-1%)
All P-T Males (266)	126 (47%)	107 (40%)	25 (9%)	8 (3%)

B. PART-TIME FEMALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (49)	14 (29%)	27 (55%)	7 (14%)	1 (2%)
Rural (132)	80 (60%)	49 (37%)	3 (2%)	0
All P-T Females (181)	94 (52%)	76 (42%)	10 (6%)	1 (-1%)

C. ALL PART-TIME MALE AND FEMALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
All Metro (108)	26 (24%)	54 (50%)	21 (19%)	7 (6%)
All Rural (339)	194 (57%)	129 (35%)	14 (4%)	2 (-1%)
All P-T Couns. (447)	220 (49%)	183 (40%)	35 (8%)	9 (2%)

TABLE # 3c

TRAINING OF FULL-TIME COUNSELLORS - ACCORDING TO LOCATION AND SEX -
REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

A. FULL-TIME MALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (47)	2 (4%)	8 (17%)	20 (42%)	17 (36%)
Rural (36)	2 (6%)	17 (47%)	12 (33%)	5 (14%)
All F-T Males (83)	4 (5%)	25 (30%)	32 (38%)	22 (26%)

B. FULL-TIME FEMALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (43)	4 (9%)	19 (44%)	13 (30%)	7 (16%)
Rural (8)	3 (37%)	3 (37%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)
All F-T Females (51)	7 (13%)	22 (43%)	14 (27%)	8 (16%)

C. ALL FULL-TIME MALE AND FEMALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
All Metro (90)	6 (6%)	27 (30%)	33 (36%)	24 (26%)
All Rural (44)	5 (11%)	20 (45%)	13 (30%)	6 (13%)
All F-T Couns. (134)	11 (8%)	47 (35%)	46 (35%)	30 (22%)

TABLE # 3d

SUMMARY OF THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL - ENGAGED IN GUIDANCE DUTIES
 ACCORDING TO SEX AND LOCATION - REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES

A. MALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (106)	14 (12%)	35 (33%)	34 (32%)	23 (21%)
Rural (232)	116 (50%)	96 (41%)	23 (9%)	7 (3%)
All Males (338)	130 (38%)	131 (38%)	57 (16%)	30 (8%)

B. FEMALE COUNSELLORS:

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
Metro (92)	18 (19%)	46 (50%)	20 (21%)	8 (8%)
Rural (140)	83 (59%)	52 (37%)	4 (2%)	1 (-1%)
All Females (232)	101 (43%)	98 (42%)	24 (10%)	9 (4%)

TABLE # 3e

SUMMARY OF THE TRAINING OF ALL PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN GUIDANCE DUTIES IN MANITOBA SCHOOLS (PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME, MALE AND FEMALE) - ACCORDING TO LOCATION - REPORTED IN PERCENTAGES.

Location	No Formal Preparation	Related Courses Only	BEd. (Guidance)	MEd. (Counselling)
All Metro (198)	32 (16%)	81 (40%)	54 (27%)	31 (15%)
All Rural (372)	199 (53%)	148 (39%)	27 (7%)	8 (2%)
All Guid. Per. (570)	231 (40%)	229 (40%)	81 (14%)	39 (6%)

TABLE # 4

PROCEDURAL STAGES FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF MANITOBA'S SCHOOL COUNSELLORS

1. Analysis of the background of current Manitoba Guidance personnel.
2. Study of Canadian and U.S. approaches to certification (methodology and problems).
3. a) Dissemination of data re certification - discussion and feedback.
b) Survey of Manitoba counsellors' reactions to certification.
4. Adoption of an interim (non-certification) procedure.
5. Implementation, through legislation, of a full system of school counsellor certification.

TABLE # 5a

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF SCAM SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Current Training or degree sought	Number (total 245)	Per Cent of Respondents
MEd (Counselling)	27	11%
MEd (Other)	9	4%
Working on MEd (Counselling)	23	9%
BEd (Guidance)	33	13%
BEd (Other)	40	16%
Working on BEd (Guidance)	40	16%
Guidance In-Service	17	7%
Other Training	29	11%
Other Degrees	27	11%
Working on BEd (Guid.) or better	123	50%
All other Training	125	50%

TABLE # 5b

RESPONSES OF WHETHER OR NOT CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL COUNSELLORS IS REQUIRED (ACCORDING TO SCAM SURVEY RESPONDENTS), IN TERMS OF COUNSELLOR LOCATION, CURRENT TIME SPENT IN GUIDANCE, TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION, TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE IN COUNSELLING, AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING. - REPORTED AS PERCENTAGES.

A. BY LOCATION:

Certification Necessary	Rural (Total 140)	Urban (Total 105)	All Guidance Personnel
Yes	78%	82%	80%
No	22%	18%	20%

B. BY CURRENT TIME SPENT IN GUIDANCE:

Certification Necessary	Less Than 25%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	Full-Time	Totals Less Than Half-Time	Totals Half-Time to Full-Time
Yes	75%	75%	84%	80%	93%	75%	87%
No	25%	25%	16%	20%	7%	25%	13%

C. BY TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION:

Certification Necessary	0-2 Years	3-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	16-20 Years	21+ Years	Totals 0-10 Years	Totals 11-20 Years	Totals 21+ Years
Yes	87%	87%	75%	76%	81%	79%	81%	78%	79%
No	13%	13%	25%	24%	19%	21%	19%	22%	21%

D. BY TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE IN SCHOOL COUNSELLING:

Certification Necessary	0-2 Years	3-5 Years	6-10 Years	11+ Years	Totals 0-10 Years	Totals 11+ Years
Yes	71%	86%	74%	75%	80%	75%
No	29%	14%	26%	25%	20%	25%

E. BY PROFESSIONAL TRAINING:

Certification Necessary	MEd (Couns.)	MEd (Other)	Working on MEd (Couns.)	BEEd (Guid.)	BEEd (Other)	Working on BEEd (Guid.)	Guidance In-Service	Other Courses	Other Degrees	BEEd (Guid.) or Better	totals	totals
Yes	100%	77%	91%	81%	70%	87%	70%	68%	73%	90%	75%	
No	0	23%	9%	19%	30%	13%	30%	32%	27%	10%	25%	

TABLE # 5c

MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LEVEL OF TRAINING FOR CERTIFICATION
AS REPORTED BY EACH GROUP

Current Professional Training	Minimum Acceptable Training		
	MEd (Couns.) + add. work	MEd (Couns.)	BEd (Guid.)
MEd (Counselling)	11%	18%	59%
MEd (Other)	0	11%	33%
Working on MEd (Couns.)	0	25%	69%
BEd (Guidance)	0	9%	89%
BEd (Other)	0	2%	57%
Working on BEd (Guid.)	0	4%	64%
Guidance In-Service	0	10%	60%
Other Training	0	0	26%
Other Degrees	4%	0	46%
Total All Groups	2%	8%	56%

Group Summaries	BEd (Guid.) or Better Required
All Rural	58%
All Urban	74%
All Full-Time	80%
All Part-Time	62%
Total All Groups	66%

TABLE # 5d

AMOUNT OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE REQUIRED FOR CERTIFICATION
AS REPORTED BY EACH GROUP

Current Professional Training	Teaching Experience Required			
	Not Necessary	1 Year	2 Years	More than 2 Years
MEd (Counselling)	33%	3%	44%	18%
MEd (Other)	0	0	55%	45%
Working on MEd (Couns.)	34%	17%	34%	13%
BEd (Guidance)	15%	21%	39%	24%
BEd (Other)	4%	7%	26%	60%
Working on BEd (Guid.)	27%	22%	30%	20%
Guidance In-Service	5%	5%	23%	64%
Other Training	13%	3%	24%	58%
Other Degrees	3%	25%	29%	40%
BEd (Guid.) or Better	27%	14%	39%	19%
All Others	12%	12%	29%	46%
Those not working toward grad. degrees in Guidance	8%	12%	26%	53%

Group Summaries	Not Necessary	1 Year	2 Years	2+ Years
All Rural	15%	13%	30%	40%
All Urban	19%	13%	35%	32%
All Full-Time	29%	13%	29%	27%
All Part-Time	13%	13%	33%	39%
Total All Groups	16%	13%	32%	37%

TABLE # 5e

AMOUNT OF WORK EXPERIENCE REQUIRED (OTHER THAN TEACHING) FOR CERTIFICATION
AS REPORTED BY EACH GROUP

Current Professional Training	Work Experience Required			
	Not Necessary	1 Year	2 Years	More Than 2 Years
MEd (Counselling)	51%	11%	29%	8%
MEd (Other)	66%	23%	0	11%
Working on MEd (Couns.)	73%	13%	4%	10%
BEd (Guidance)	63%	12%	18%	7%
BEd (Other)	72%	10%	12%	6%
Working on BEd (Guid.)	65%	15%	5%	15%
Guidance In-Service	64%	5%	0	31%
Other Training	41%	17%	17%	25%
Other Degrees	70%	14%	7%	7%

Group Summaries	Not Necessary	1 Year	2 Years	2+ Years
All Rural	59%	16%	10%	15%
All Urban	68%	8%	13%	11%
All Full-Time	59%	20%	13%	6%
All Part-Time	64%	11%	11%	12%
Total All Groups	63%	13%	11%	11%